



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Tehachapi-Cummings County Water District	County	Kern (portion of)
		Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
Project Title	Cummings Basin Groundwater Model Update	Total Project Cost	\$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The project improves groundwater management within Cummings, Brite, and Tehachapi groundwater basins. This will be accomplished through the implementation of a Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program and updating the Cummings Basin groundwater model.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	34

- **GWMP or Program:** The Brite, Cummings, and Tehachapi Basins are adjudicated groundwater basins. The base water rights of the Tehachapi Groundwater Basin were established by the Judgment from California Superior Court Case No. 97210 in 1971. A Judgment was filed in 1970 for the Brite Groundwater Basin in the Kern County Superior Court Case No. 97211. The Judgment resulted in a Safe Yield of 500 AFY being established among other findings. The Judgment for the Cummings Groundwater Basin was filed in 1972 in the Kern County Superior Court Case No. 97209. Each of the Judgments incorporated the following requirements: Appointed TCCWD as Watermaster and designated duties, powers, and responsibilities; Injunction against exporting native groundwater from the basin; Injunction against diverting surface water from the watershed. A copy of the judgments is included in the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The application contains 2 projects. Detailed descriptions of both projects are included. The applicant includes a complete and detailed description of the proposed projects; demonstrates collaboration with other local agencies; shows the long-term need and merit for the proposed projects; shows that a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management; and explains how the projects will continue to be funded after the expenditure of grant funds. For Project 2, the application states that the updated model would “assist the District in evaluating the current condition of the groundwater supplies in the Basin and, through future work, determine potential impacts on groundwater resources in the Cummings Basin in response to scenarios that will be defined at a later date.” However, it is not explained what “future work” entails or how the model would function under “future scenarios” which have not yet been defined.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The tasks in the work plan for both projects are detailed sufficiently. Project deliverables are clearly stated in Task 1.2 DWR Grant Reporting. The work plan for both projects is consistent with and supports the budget and schedule. There is direct correspondence of the task numbers in the work plan with those in the schedule and the budget. The tasks in each project all fulfill the proposal’s goals and objectives. One task, however, lacks sufficient information. Project 1 Subtask 2.3 states that “approximately 50 wells throughout the three basins will be included in the monitoring program”; Subtask 2.4 states that “a Right-of-Entry will need to be authorized by the well owner”; and Subtask 2.5 states that “samples will need to be tested monthly for the first three months”. However no letter, agreement, or other documentation was provided stating that access to 50 wells in all required areas would be assured.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. There was explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the estimate including water quality sampling and testing, consultant fees, and contingency fees. The task numbers were numbered consistently compared with the schedule and the work plan.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed and is supported thorough sufficient documentation or logical rationale. The schedule categories and subcategories are consistent with the work plan and budget. The timeline between tasks appears reasonable. The tasks and subtasks appear to be realistic for the amount of work proposed and the start and end dates are within the designated time frame, with potential delays being accounted for. Major milestones as described in the work plan are shown on the schedule.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The QA/QC section contained procedural assurances, personnel qualifications, and standardized methodologies and analyses including adherence to specified USGS and ASTM standards for development of the groundwater network, groundwater sampling and testing, and groundwater modeling. QA/QC reporting procedures are described.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant provided summaries for 5 projects completed, only 2 of which were comparable to the proposal. However, supporting documentation was only included for one of the projects, the Tehachapi Groundwater Basin Study, which referred to but did not include the final report. No other documentation was provided for the past performance projects listed in the grant.